DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 982 JC 760 435

AUTHOR Day, Robert W.; Bender, Louis W.
TITLE The State Role in Program Evaluation of Community Colleges: Emerging Concepts and Trends.
INSTITUTION Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. State and Regional Higher Education Center.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM FSU State and Regional Higher Education Center, College of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; National Surveys; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning; *State Agencies; State Boards of Education

ABSTRACT

Historically, the community college has been viewed as an institution which should be as indigenous as possible. However, the role of the state is becoming increasingly crucial to the daily operations of the community college. This monograph reports the conduct and results of a nationwide study of state agencies responsible for community college coordination or control to ascertain whether criteria and procedures have been developed to evaluate or suspend extant community college programs, and to evaluate "the state of the art." Respondents to the survey included 51 agencies from 38 states. Analysis of responses reveals that, increasingly, states use one or more criteria at either the state or institutional level for evaluation of community college programs. Agency evaluation procedures range from review based upon institutional recommendations, to statewide accreditation, to development of a special program evaluation body. Most state agencies have developed and formalized a supportive means for program evaluation although local institutions appear to have the final word on suspension or termination of extant programs. Six case studies demonstrating agencies' program evaluation criteria and procedures are included. Appended are program evaluation criteria and procedures utilized by those state agencies which responded in this study. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED126982

THE STATE ROLE IN PROGRAM EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES: EMERGING CONCEPTS AND TRENDS

by

Robert W. Day

and

Louis W. Bender

Division of Education Management Systems
College of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
July, 1976

A publication of the State and Regional Higher Education Center, College of Education, The Florida State University with assistance of a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

JC 760 435

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface		iii
Introduction		1
Study of State Systems Conducted		5
Criteria Used for Program Evaluation		6
Procedures Used for Program Evaluation		7
Case Studies for Program Evaluation		10
	Arkansas	10
	California	11
	Maryland	12
	North Carolina	14
	Oklahoma	15
	Virginia	18
Considerations in Program Suspension and Termination		20
Appendix	Program Evaluation Criteria and Procedures Used By State Agencies Responding In This Study (Data Current as of Spring, 1976)	25
Bibliography		35
Notes About the Authors		36

Preface

Postsecondary education is under attack, charged with being unaccountable in its programming and in its use of public funds. Accountability has been the watchword of the last five years and has been laid at the feet of colleges and universities like a gauntlet by legislative committees and public critics. Community colleges, which probably have a higher public acceptance rating than any other postsecondary educational institution in contemporary society, have also become the targets of those who insist postsecondary education has been wasteful of tax resources while championing the existence of the institution and the security of those employed rather than the services and programs to accommodate student needs.

The state agency responsible for community colleges has felt the sting of such pressures as well. On the one hand, the public and legislators clamor for greater surveillance at the state level to be sure that tax resources are used efficiently and that institutions are "accountable" in carrying out their educational mission. In some cases the state coordinating or governing board has even imposed a program review requirement on all segments of public higher education. On the other hand, community colleges in some states have become increasingly critical of the state community college agency because of requirements to report enrollments, graduation and placement rates and unit cost analysis of various programs offered.

While community colleges historically have been perceived as the appropriate level and locus for program planning, initiation,

and evaluation, events such as the recent national recession have brought pressures for change. With "steady-state" funding levels characterized by most states since the national recession, more attention must be given to programs which cannot be defended on the basis of productivity or cost effectiveness. While the indigenous character of the community college has always promoted the ideal that the local institution should determine what programs to offer and what programs to eliminate, priorities must increasingly be established on broader than provincial criteria and standards.

The role of the state agency responsible for community colleges in evaluating programs of the community colleges is growing. Even in those states where legal authority resides with the local institution, agencies have begun to assist by providing guidelines and suggested criteria to enable a local institution to have a basis for prioritizing and decision-making.

This monograph should be of assistance to State Higher Education Executive Officers as well as State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges. It has been produced as part of the activities of the State and Regional Higher Education Center of the Florida State University which is supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The Center operates as part of a partnership with the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida and is committed to the pre-service and in-service training of professionals who serve in state or regional agencies. It is also committed to the study of issues and problems which confront these agencies and their officials. Inquiries related to services or programs of the Center are always welcomed.

Louis W. Bender, Director
and Professor of Higher Education

Introduction

Historically, the community college has been viewed as an institution which should be as indigenous as possible. Regardless of the organizational structure of a given state, few would argue with the desirability of the institution to serve local community needs for postsecondary education opportunity and for training of individuals who aspire to enter occupational fields of endeavor. Even the contemporary focus of the American Association of Community Junior Colleges and various other national groups for community-based postsecondary education undergird the principle that the educational program of the community college must have local elements of planning, design, implementation, review, and evaluation.

At an opposite end of a continuum we find the role of the state becoming increasingly crucial to the day-to-day operations of the college. Enabling legislation, in most states, provides for two specific state levels of interaction between the local institution and the state. Most states have provided for statewide coordinating or governing agencies and charge them with broad powers of planning, program review, budget review, and evaluation. These responsibilities encompass the total system of postsecondary education in which community colleges can be viewed as a subsystem in the same manner that state colleges would be viewed as a subsystem.

The state agency having specific responsibility for community colleges, usually in the same enabling legislation which provides for the local institution, typically is charged by the legislature with planning, program review or approval, budget review or approval, and

evaluation of the constituent institutions within the subsystem. Traditionally the state community college agency has assumed an advocacy posture in behalf of the local institutions when interacting with the other subsystems under the state coordinating or governing agency. As a result, the state agency has sought to champion the growth and development of the institution and to foster new programs as identified by the local institution. Until a few years ago, growth was a constant and thus little needed to be done other than to assist local institutions in developing plans for new programs through state level staff and program development efforts. The need for program review and evaluation did not appear to be necessary.

Because of the philosophic tradition of the community college having prime authority for planning and initiating new programs to serve local needs and because state community college agencies have previously concentrated on advocacy and promotion of the local institution, the function of program review and evaluation had been overlooked or left with the local institution. However, state legislatures have increasingly pressed for more effective use of resources and documentation of increasing educational productivity. The theme of the 1974 convention of the American Association of Higher Education was "Accountability in Higher Education." Harold Hodgkinson observed that the public might not expect more education for less money but the signs were that the public would expect more education for the same money. John Millett in a speech to the same conference declared that accountability in higher education would need to answer such questions as "How can we make the educational process more efficient?", "How can we make it more effective and increase its productivity?" and

"How can we demonstrate that it is productive?". The Joint Commission on Educational Goals and Evaluation of the California State Legislature in 1970 called for increasing educational productivity in cost effectiveness by maximizing facility use, by pruning low enrollment programs, by encouraging year-round operation, by utilizing informations systems and improved management techniques, and by developing efficient budgeting and budget review approaches. Thus national and state pressures have been on the evaluation as well as the approval process.

Statewide coordinating or governing boards have begun to exercise some of their authority vested for program review in an attempt to be sure that the legislature's demand for eliminating high cost and low yield programs is met. As a result, pressures from these statewide bodies upon the state community college agency has been felt in some states. In other states, the legislature has pressed directly upon the state community college agency calling for closer scrutiny of program development to avert unnecessary proliferation and duplication of programs.

At the local level, community colleges typically had control over determining what programs would be offered, the priority of introducing new programs, as well as control over the evaluation of the effectiveness of those programs. The prerogative to evaluate programs in order to determine whether to suspend on a temporary basis or to terminate an effective program on a permanent basis seems to have been rarely used in many institutions since most were oriented toward and more concerned about growth and expansion rather than evaluation. As a consequence, many unneeded programs were retained in some institutions leading to

drains on the budget and inequities of staffing.

Community college officials at all levels are beginning to assess more closely their program planning efforts in an attempt to identify programs which no longer serve community and/or student needs and which divert needed resources from programs of higher priority. This awareness has prompted officials in many states to establish new evaluative criteria and procedures by which institutions can suspend or terminate their own programs at will.

Once concerned with new program development and growth, many community colleges are now forced to take stock of their existing program offerings to determine their effectiveness. Evidence of this emerging trend can be found by examining the new criteria and procedures being developed by many higher education coordinating agencies and community college state agencies in response to demands for even greater social and economic accountability in community college systems. In certain states, community colleges have been viewed by state legislators as the "darlings" of higher education and have somehow taken for granted their acceptance and support by powerful legislative delegations who previously did not make specific inquiries into the success of community college program offerings. Community colleges must now reckon with such inquiries, including state agency audits, legislative studies on program proliferation and duplication, and program and budgetary studies by divisions of administration in state government. As a result, a very real trend appears imminent in the community college at the present time, namely, the effort by both state agencies and local institutions to identify criteria and procedures which are used for evaluation

and possible suspension or termination of existing programs.

Study of State Systems Conducted

Recognizing the imminent changes in its own two-year technical colleges and responding to a direct request from members of its State Board Education Committee relative to procedures used in other states, the Division of Educational Services of the South Carolina Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (TEC) undertook a nationwide study of state-level agencies responsible for community college coordination or control to ascertain whether criteria and procedures have been developed to evaluate or suspend existing community college programs and to evaluate "the state of the art."

This study involved contacting the state offices holding affiliation with either the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC) or the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) during the Spring of 1976. This survey included state departments of education, university boards of regents, statewide governing and coordinating boards of higher education, and statewide governing and coordinating boards for community colleges. Since many states have more than one board responsible for community college program development and review, all pertinent state-level agencies in each state were contacted.

Responses were received from fifty-one (51) separate agencies in thirty-eight (38) states. Of the fifty-one agencies, however, only forty-four (44) agencies have some degree of responsibility

for community college program development. Hence, these agencies were the focus of inquiry for the purpose of this study.

Criteria Used for Program Evaluation

An analysis of documents received from forty-four (44) agencies reveals that a growing number of states now use one or more criteria at either the state level or the institutional level for evaluating programs in community colleges. Although most agencies do not currently possess authority to actually suspend or terminate institutional programs, it appears that state agencies either have formal criteria or are studying possible criteria for institutional application within their states.

From the responses received from the agencies, there are twelve (12) criteria most frequently cited in pertinent documents or in correspondence received from the agencies. These criteria are:

(1) Enrollment in the program over the previous three or five year period;

(2) Productivity of graduates in the program over the previous three or five year period;

(3) Class size;

(4) Placement record;

(5) Employment needs;

(6) Cost per student when compared to other community college programs;

(7) Faculty qualifications;

(8) Availability of similar programs elsewhere in the state;

(9) Student demand and interest;

(10) Budgetary priority;

(11) Salary level of graduates; and

(12) Compatibility of the program with the mission of the institution.

It should be noted that in all states which apply criteria for program evaluation, some combination of criteria is used. Among the states responding in this survey, no state utilizes only one criterion such as low enrollment as the basis for suspending or terminating programs in community colleges. This is true both in states where local institutions have developed criteria and in states where state governing or coordinating agencies have developed criteria.

Among the criteria most frequently cited by state agency staff, student enrollment, productivity of graduates, program cost, and placement were chief factors in the review of community college programs. In a number of states, however, both institutions and state agencies are still searching for valid and reliable criteria which can be used for program evaluation in the community college. At least half a dozen agency staff members requested that we send them criteria and procedures which are finally developed in South Carolina for the evaluation of program offerings.

Procedures Used for Program Evaluation

The procedures used by state agencies and institutions for evaluating programs in the community college vary considerably among the states. From the correspondence received, most state agencies merely review or approve new programs and rely on institutions to determine which programs are no longer needed and how programs can

be evaluated. This is particularly true in those states having statewide coordinating agencies or state departments of education with very little authority over community college program follow-up and evaluation, such as the coordinating agencies in Indiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Although program evaluation was an expressed concern by officials in certain of these states, their agencies do not currently possess the authority to enforce criteria or procedures for program evaluation within community colleges.

A second group of states conducts program evaluation through regular state agency staff reviews or statewide accreditation programs in community colleges. From these activities, institutions are often alerted to those programs which need further study or which should be terminated. However, even in these states, institutions rather than the state agency hold the final authority to suspend or terminate existing programs. The state agency staff or state accrediting team serves in an advisory and consultative capacity to provide the framework and procedures for institutional decision-making relative to program evaluation and/or termination. These procedures currently exist in a number of states which responded in this survey, including Arkansas, Kansas, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, and Oklahoma. This means for program evaluation is also being explored in other states, including Connecticut, Minnesota, New York, and Texas.

A third group of states has more than one agency responsible for coordination or control of community college program evaluation. In these states, there is varying degree of control of program review or termination, although generally one agency has developed criteria

and procedures for statewide application. This pattern currently prevails in the states of Colorado, Illinois, and Virginia.

A fourth group of states has community colleges which are governed at the state level by a state board of regents (Georgia, Oklahoma, and West Virginia) or a university governing board (Kentucky and Nevada). The community colleges in these states may be more likely subjected to internal criteria and procedures which are mandated by a more powerful governing agency. However, there is no evidence from the materials received that community colleges administered by a board of regents or a university governing board have been subjected to program evaluation or termination more frequently than community colleges in other states.

In summary, most state agencies have developed and formalized some means for evaluating programs in community colleges which is designed to support and assist local institutions. Local institutions still appear to have the final word on the suspension or termination of existing programs, regardless of the degree of participation of state agencies in the evaluation process. To an increasing extent, criteria are formalized through some coordinative efforts at the state level, but are applied through the local efforts of community college faculty and staff

The criteria and procedures used in the state agencies responding to this survey are provided in Appendix A of this study. For further illumination, however, the criteria and procedures from certain states will be described in greater detail in the next section. Although called "case studies," the criteria and procedures described in these states are exemplary and representative of the types of program evaluation currently being conducted in community college systems.

Case Studies for Program Evaluation

Six states have been selected for further delineation of community college program evaluation criteria and procedures. These six states are: Arkansas, California, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia. In each case, state agency officials responding to this survey felt comfortable with the procedures used in their state despite some possible limitations. A summary of each state follows.

Arkansas

In Arkansas, the Department of Higher Education assists all postsecondary institutions in "isolating" costly and unproductive programs which can be studied further by institutional staff. Criteria vary among different types of postsecondary institutions according to the degree level of the institutions concerned. The criteria for "isolating" certificate and associate degree programs in community colleges are:

(1) Programs which have graduated less than ten students for the past three years;

(2) Programs which fall in the highest 25 percent of programs in terms of the cost to the institution per FTE student;

(3) Programs which have experienced a 25 percent decline in numbers of graduates over the previous five years;

(4) Programs offered by an institution that are duplicated at another public college or university in the state within a fifty mile radius; and

(5) Programs which will require additional expenditures for added faculty, library holdings, facilities, or equipment.[1]

---

[1] "Review of Existing Instructional Programs, 1975-76," unpublished document, Little Rock: Arkansas Department of Higher Education, 1976.

Pertinent data on the above criteria are received from both Department of Higher Education files and from the community colleges in Arkansas during each biennium. Community colleges are expected to review all programs of three years' duration which are isolated by any one the five criteria. The degree of concern for review increases in proportion to the number of items under which a program is isolated .

Institutional personnel determine the appropriate course of action on programs which have been isolated. Among the alternatives open to the institution are: (1) termination of the program, (2) combination of the program with another, (3) continuation of the program with available information and adequate projections for the future, and (4) establishing a probationary status for the program until established conditions are met.[1]

Program evaluation has been conducted in Arkansas since the 1971-1973 biennium. The criteria for review have been broadened to include the five criteria listed above, and apparently the entire procedure of program isolation and evaluation has proven useful in the Arkansas system.

California

The California Community College System utilizes a means for evaluating occupational programs which was begun in 1971 by a consortium of community colleges in a cooperative effort with the Chancellor's Office. COPES (Community College Occupational Programs Evaluation System) has been used voluntarily by over fifty (50)

---

[1]"Review of Existing Instructional Programs," op. cit., p. 1.

California community colleges in an effort to evaluate and upgrade occupational education. The self-appraisal process involves the study of occupational experience of instructors, quality of instruction, qualifications of staff, growth of offerings in response to needs, adequacy of instructional equipment, and other pertinent evaluative criteria.[1]

COPES evaluation teams serve in a consultative capacity for participating community colleges. The strength of the COPES model seems to lie in the composition of evaluation teams which are broad-based and representative. Among the persons serving on evaluation teams are members of occupational education advisory committees, persons from business and industry, and students in occupational programs. A number of other states have examined the COPES model for possible use in the evaluation of occupational programs in their own state.

Maryland

In Maryland, the Maryland Board for Community Colleges utilizes a Community College Career Program Evaluation Committee to develop an on-going system for institutional program review. The Committee, comprised of institutional deans and state-level staff from the Division of Vocational-Technical Education in the Department of Education and from the state office for community colleges, has developed a two-pronged approach. The first level of evaluation involves the identification of program objectives and standards for quality control to determine whether:

---

[1]"Community College Occupational Programs Evaluation System," Sacramento: California Community Colleges, October, 1975.

(1) Projected enrollment has materialized;

(2) Projected completions have materialized;

(3) Completions have been employed in the field of training;

(4) Early leavers with marketable skills are employed in the field of training;

(5) Anticipated salaries have materialized;

(6) Program costs are within the projected range;

(7) Projected qualified faculty are employed;

(8) Use has been made of local non-college facilities and equipment when available and appropriate;

(9) Program has received documented, favorable response from business, government, or industry.[1]

When Level I evaluation reveals that further study is needed of individual programs, the Level II evaluation is undertaken. Level II involves a comprehensive self-study of deficient programs. Self-study teams are appointed by the president, and typically include at least one student enrolled in the program or recent graduate, one member of the community who employs program graduates, faculty members from the program, administrators responsible for career programs, and possibly a staff member from the Division of Vocational-Technical Education. The self-study team examines deficient programs in five areas: (1) objectives, (2) instructional process, (3) facilities and installation, (4) product, and (5) cost effectiveness. Specific details for the conduct of the self-study are described in the publication, "A System for the Evaluation of Career Programs in the Community Colleges of Maryland."[2]

---

[1]"A System for the Evaluation of Career Programs in Community Colleges of Maryland," Annapolis: Community College Career Program Evaluation Committee, 1974.

[2]Ibid.

Community colleges have responded well to the evaluation of deficient programs which do not meet limits of program acceptability. Typically, the identification of discrepancies results in one of three possible courses of action: (1) modification of the program or its limits of acceptability for purposes of evaluation, (2) the suspension of the program, or (3) the termination of the program. Through the participatory efforts of state and local officials in the systematic program evaluation process, the Maryland Board for Community Colleges has recommended the discontinuance of twenty-six (26) programs in the state since 1969.[1]

North Carolina

In North Carolina, the 57 community colleges and technical institutes under the jurisdiction of the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges are subject to accreditation procedures as a means for program review and evaluation. A comprehensive self-study and evaluation program is required for each institution to be eligible for accreditation by the North Carolina Department of Education. The standards and procedures very closely parallel the standards and procedures used by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the regional accrediting agency. Typically, state accreditation teams and institutional self-studies will be conducted simultaneously with the self-study and evaluation for the Southern Association.

The standards and evaluative criteria used for North Carolina institutions are described in a publication entitled, "Standards and

---

[1] "Maryland State Board for Community Colleges Bulletin," Vol. 3, No. 6 (February, 1975), p. 4.

Evaluative Criteria."[1] This document outlines the standards and evaluative criteria in eight major areas, including the area of "Educational Programs." Standards and evaluative criteria for assessing the quality of the educational programs of community colleges are categorized under the areas of admissions, curriculum, and instruction. Each of these areas includes evaluative criteria for: (1) all programs, (2) college transfer and general education courses and programs, (3) occupational education programs, and (4) occupational extension, continuing education and community service programs. Evaluative criteria are qualitative, although very specific. They include the adequacy of staffing, equipment and supplies, facilities, instructional methods, syllabi, evaluation, and placement and follow-up of students.

The 57 community colleges and technical institutes in North Carolina are relatively autonomous, independent institutions which are locally governed. Decisions relative to program suspension or termination are made locally, but presumably are reached partially through the self-study and accreditation process of the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges. This agency was unable to provide more specific information on numbers and types of programs which have been actually suspended or terminated in the North Carolina system.

Oklahoma

In Oklahoma, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have broad responsibilities for the establishing of standards and the

---

[1]"Standards and Evaluative Criteria," Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Community Colleges, December, 1975.

evaluation of postsecondary vocational and technical programs in all Oklahoma postsecondary educational institutions. Under a policy adopted by the State Regents in October, 1975, all institutions shall have their technical and occupational education programs evaluated at least once every five years. As part of the evaluation procedure, institutions will be required to provide a self-study report during that year and in advance of a visiting committee evaluation. The committees will be comprised of educators from peer institutions, recognized consultants from program areas to be evaluated, and members of the State Regents' staff with program responsibilities.

Among the criteria used to evaluate technical-occupational programs are:

(1) regional and state accreditation of the institution, or expectation to achieve accreditation within a reasonable period of time;

(2) a written statement of goals and objectives on file at the institution for each technical-occupational program offered;

(3) the use of a functional advisory committee for each specialty area in which programs are to be operated;

(4) the enlistment of support of community business and industry organizations and leaders to provide input for program development and operation, to develop a ready market for job placement, and to obtain feedback as to the performance of graduates from technical-occupational programs;

(5) academic and experience standards for instructional personnel in technical-occupational programs shall be the same as for those instructors in other postsecondary programs;

(6) the budgeting and expenditure of an amount of funds needed to develop and maintain program viability for occupational-technical programs;

(7) adequacy of physical facilities and instructional equipment of the type and quality necessary to develop pride on the part of students, to attract and retain capable faculty, and engender respect on the part of the community at large;

(8) admission of students into programs based on their interests and abilities to help them complete the required curriculum and succeed in their chosen field;

(9) adequacy of student services program, including personal guidance, career counseling, job placement and follow-up procedures to assure a proper job fit for graduates; and

(10) institutional review and evaluation of all technical-occupational programs continually and at least once every five years.[1]

As a state governing agency, the State Regents for Higher Education will enforce compliance with these criteria through the accreditation process and will evidently use program evaluations as a basis for state-level decision-making. The procedures for evaluation of technical-occupational programs call for the preparation of a staff report containing program evaluations conducted for each of the institutions visited each spring, as well as recommendations made by visiting committees and staff. The State Regents will utilize the results of these staff reports in making decisions relating to the approval of new programs, the continuation or attenuation of existing programs, and the level of funding needed for the operation of quality programs of a technical-occupational nature.[2] Clearly, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education will assume a more active role in program evaluation and possible termination in the community college system of that state.

---

[1] "Criteria and Procedures for the Evaluation of Technical-Occupational Programs in Oklahoma Postsecondary Education," unpublished document, Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, October, 1975, pp. 2-3.

[2] Ibid.

Virginia

In Virginia, the State Council of Higher Education, a coordinating agency, has developed productivity criteria in the biennial evaluation of all postsecondary educational programs in the state. Council-approved guidelines for program evaluation have also been adopted by the State Board for Community Colleges, a governing agency. The State Board in Virginia has utilized these criteria for program evaluation and termination in Virginia community colleges.[1]

Staff members of the State Board for Community Colleges undertake program evaluation and application of these guidelines. Evaluations, however, apply only to associate degree programs in community colleges. Furthermore, a three-year start-up period is allowed for associate degree programs before they are subject to evaluation to assure that at least one cycle of graduates has been completed.

Program evaluation guidelines require a minimum annual average number of graduates over the previous five-year period for each associate degree program (10 graduates for Associate in Arts and Associate in Science programs and 7 graduates for Associate in Applied Science programs). Programs not meeting this criterion warrant the consideration of other justifications for program evaluation.

Additionally, programs are evaluated in terms of their overall productivity through their service function to related programs. For example, secretarial science courses and faculty may be used to support more programs than just an associate degree program in secretarial science.

---

[1] "The Quantitative Evaluation of Degree Programs," unpublished document, Richmond: State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, 1974.

Thus, in Virginia's community colleges, productivity is measured in terms of numbers of graduates and the service of individual curricula to other similar programs.

On the basis of these productivity criteria, the State Board for Community Colleges evaluated 436 programs in 23 community colleges for a study presented to the State Council of Higher Education in February, 1976. Of these programs, 34 programs were voluntarily terminated by the Community College Board, 5 programs were closed by the State Council of Higher Education, 5 programs were combined into two programs, and deferral was taken on one program. As a result, approximately 10 percent of the programs in the Virginia Community College System were terminated.[1]

Most of the programs terminated were inactive or low enrollment technology programs in areas such as Engineering Technology, Furniture Production, Agricultural Business, and Merchandising. No one area appeared to be "favored" for termination over another area. According to the Virginia Community College System News, the State Board has reviewed another 27 programs and has supported their continuation until a progress report was received on each one at the end of the 1975-76 year.[2] Clearly, a strong stance on program accountability according to prescribed standards has been taken in the Virginia Community College System.

---

[1]Personal communication from Daniel E. Marvin, Jr., Director of the State Council of Higher Education, to members of SHEEO, March 4, 1976.

[2]"Programs are Dropped," The VCCS News, Richmond: Virginia Department of Community Colleges, Winter, 1976), p. 1.

Considerations in Program Suspension and Termination

The analysis of documents received from state agencies for community colleges confirms a growing trend toward auch agencies assuming increasing responsibility for program evaluation in the community college and in a few cases using program evaluation as a means to suspend or terminate high cost ineffective programs. With the prevailing trend in this direction, community college officials at the state and local level would do well to recognize the need to formulate an overall policy related to program evaluation which could be understood by all and consistently applied throughout the state. Regardless of how objective the evaluative criteria and procedures may be, individual careers of both faculty and students may be impaired by decisions to suspend or terminate community college programs. The implications can be far reaching.

When it becomes apparent that a program no longer is cost effective, regardless of whether the decision is made by the state or the institution, consideration must be given to those students who will be affected. There was no evidence from this study that any state had conducted a survey of constituent institutions to determine the impact of suspended or terminated programs over a period of time upon the student. It can only be assumed that relatively few students are affected when programs are terminated but that does not recognize the fact that an individual student might well have interests and career ambitions which are stifled if not jeopardized by the program termination. It would appear desirable for state agencies to assess the nature and scope of this problem and to work cooperatively with

the institutions in planning an appropriate solution. At least three different approaches suggest themselves for assisting students who are caught in such a dilemma. First, many of the occupational programs lend themselves to competency-based mediated instructional modes whereby an institution can design an individualized program appropriate to the goals of that segment of the student population seeking special training and knowledge. A second and less complex approach which has been used by some institutions is that of a contract mode whereby the institution would contract with nearby public or private institutions offering the desired program. Some community colleges have found that their high cost and low enrollment programs are similar to those offered by another institution and thus, through inter-institutional cooperation, service to the student can be achieved whether through a voluntary or contractual mode. A third approach to serving student interests and need has been employed by some community colleges which have sponsored a student from the immediate service area to another institution somewhere else in the state as part of the philosophy of serving the needs of the local citizenry. This has been accomplished in some cases by reciprocal tuition waiver agreements while in other cases by tuition or cost of education subsidies.

The impact of program termination upon faculty must also be considered. Absence of any concern for a faculty member affected by program termination is not only inhumane but can be detrimental to morale throughout the institution. As a result, some institutions have adopted a renewal or re-training policy whereby a faculty member confronted with the possible abolishment of a teaching position would be provided an opportunity to qualify for another position

within the institution through special re-training activities or by working with faculty in another department. Such policies typically engender a greater spirit of identity with the institution and reinforce a sense of professional integrity and security among those who teach in program areas which are vulnerable to suspension or termination. Another consideration for affected faculty can be enhanced by active participation by the state agency. That is a policy whereby the institution and the state agency seek to locate another appropriate teaching position for an affected faculty member, usually in another institution within the state.

The role of the state agency as the focal point of the system of community colleges can be of strategic importance in other ways. Because of its central position, the agency can coordinate program termination with other colleges within the segment whereby an orderly process is followed and dislocations are kept to a minimum. It is not infrequent that termination of an occupational program in one institution signals an emerging decrease in manpower needs and thus other institutions in the state may soon find themselves confronted with a similar decision. The state agency can be strategic in helping to determine how many programs ultimately should be maintained for statewide manpower requirements and which institution(s) will be best for continuation of programs in that field. Similarly, the state agency can play the broker role in attempting to assure parity among the institutions by assisting an institution which has terminated a program to become designated for any special new program which might be needed to meet statewide manpower needs. This compensating approach to program approval and termination can maintain balance and

vitality within the community college system.

The state agency can also assist local institutions to recoup or save funds through brokering in other ways. For example, the state may help arrange for the loan or rental or sale of equipment and materials from an institution terminating a program to another institution enlarging or introducing the program. Several states have found it appropriate to develop an equipment bank which would enable institutions to rent or borrow equipment until programs are determined to be successful and promise to be viable additions to the offering college.

In conclusion, state-level and institutional decision-makers must be aware of the personnel-and student-related implications of program suspension and termination. From the materials received, many states are now developing criteria and procedures for evaluating and possibly suspending or terminating community college programs which do not measure up to specified standards. However, the chief concerns of both state agencies and institutions appear to include "evaluative criteria," "self-study and evaluation," "productivity," and "fiscal accountability," among others. States using these judgments as the basis for program suspension or termination must also recognize the human implications of such actions and must make some accommodation to assist faculty and students who may be denied the opportunity to continue their career in their chosen field. Clearly, state agencies and local community colleges will continue to evaluate their program offerings and make value judgments on which programs to continue and expand and which programs to suspend or terminate. If the community college is to continue to be responsive to local

community needs, however, community college officials must also assume responsibility to evaluate human needs when weighing the advantages and disadvantages of suspending or terminating programs.

APPENDIX

PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED BY STATE AGENCIES RESPONDING IN THIS STUDY

(Data current as of Spring, 1976)

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
ARKANSAS		
Arkansas Department of Higher Education	Yes	1. Minimum no. of graduates less than ten for past three years 2. Program cost in top 25% of the most costly 3. Program graduates declined by 25% for past three years 4. Programs offered by another institution within a fifty mile radius 5. Programs requiring additional large expenditures State agency applies the criteria to assist institutions in isolating and evaluating unproductive programs
CALIFORNIA		
California Community College System	Yes	COPES model to evaluate occupational education programs through self-study and evaluation teams
California Postsecondary Education Commission	Yes	Program review required annually by all institutions, in addition to five-year plan up-dating
COLORADO		
Colorado Commission on Higher Education	Yes ---Criteria and procedures currently under study for all postsecondary educational programs in the state	
Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education	Yes ---Criteria and procedures being developed by the Commission on Higher Education	

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
CONNECTICUT		
Commission on Higher Education	No	
Board of Regional Community Colleges	Yes	---Criteria and procedures being developed for the evaluation of occupational programs. State master plan recommends that 20% of al programs be evaluated annually. State Board now uses a systemwide occupational education evaluation committee, and will be developing a self-study process once criteria are finalized
Board of Technical Colleges	Yes	---Institutions use follow-up studies annually in career programs. Board requires studies every ten years to match placement and follow-up data with surveys of business and industry.
DELAWARE		
Delaware Technical and Community College	Yes	1. Placement 2. Job market 3. Student demand 4. Cost of program
FLORIDA		
Division of Community Colleges, State Department of Education	Yes	Division of Community Colleges uses a statewide placement and follow-up guide to assist institutions in program evaluation. Special evaluation teams are used when necessary and upon request.

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
GEORGIA		
Board of Regents, University System of Georgia	No	
HAWAII		
University of Hawaii--Community College Division	Yes	Uses 14 criteria for evaluation, including need for program, the target groups served, etc. Uses regular self-study procedures to review all community college programs every five years.
ILLINOIS		
Illinois Board of Higher Education	Yes	1. Manpower needs 2. Availability of similar programs elsewhere in the state 3. Faculty qualifications 4. Mission of the institution
Illinois Community College Board	No	Review process is conducted by institutions. Criteria vary among institutions. State agency is involved in regional planning projects which may assist institutions to phase out programs which may no longer be needed
INDIANA		
Indiana Commission on Higher Education	No	

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
IOWA		
Iowa Department of Public Instruction	No	None for community colleges
KANSAS		
Kansas State Department of Public Instruction	Yes	Uses self-study and evaluation guide for use by statewide evaluation teams
KENTUCKY		
University of Kentucky Community College System	Yes	Historical low enrollment for the previous three year period, and other factors used by institutions
Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education	No	Relies on University of Kentucky system for program review
MARYLAND		
Maryland Board for Community Colleges	Yes	1. Enrollment 2. Completions 3. Costs 4. Job placements 5. Salary level of graduates, etc. Uses "Level I" and "Level II" evaluations of programs which do not meet prescribed standards. Uses self-study and evaluation approach developed by a state-level committee which evaluates career programs in community colleges.

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
Maryland Commission on Higher Education	No	
MASSACHUSETTS		
Massachusetts Board of Higher Education	No	
MICHIGAN		
Michigan Department of Education	Yes ---Criteria and procedures for program evaluation being studied	
MINNESOTA		
Minnesota Community College System	Yes	1. Minimum enrollment 2. Minimum of 70 percent job placement in each career program Additional criteria and procedures under study. Staff is developing an evaluation process to be conducted and coordinated by the state office.
Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission	Yes	1. Mission of institution 2. Unwarranted duplication 3. Cost benefit 4. Need for program Uses staff expertise and a representative curriculum advisory committee to evaluate programs in all postsecondary institutions.

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
MISSISSIPPI		
Division of Junior Colleges, State Department of Education	No	Institutions typically apply the following criteria: 1. Minimum enrollment of 10 students 2. Job placement 3. Qualified instructors 4. Adequate funding
MISSOURI		
Missouri Department of Higher Education	No	
NEBRASKA		
Nebraska 1202 Commission	No	
NEVADA		
University of Nevada--Community College Division	Yes	Criteria include actual or anticipated employment opportunities. Staff conducts annual reviews of all vocational programs in the community colleges.
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission	No	

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
NEW JERSEY		
New Jersey Department of Higher Education	No	
NEW YORK		
New York State Education Department	Yes	Flexible criteria used by state office staff to conduct periodic evaluation.
State University of New York System	Yes	---Task force currently studying tentative criteria and procedures. Criteria include: cost, class size, student/employer satisfaction, curriculum, faculty, employment needs, budget priorities, and existing programs in public and private institutions in the state.
NORTH CAROLINA		
North Carolina Department of Community Colleges	Yes	State office coordinates a self-study and evaluation team process as part of a statewide accreditation program. Standards for evaluation parallel those of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
OHIO		
Ohio Board of Regents	Yes	1. Current offering of courses 2. Faculty qualifications 3. Enrollment during the past five years 4. Graduates during the past five years 5. Job placement Board of Regents requires a review of each Associate Degree program every five years.
OKLAHOMA		
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Yes	Nine criteria used for the evaluation and self-study of all technical-occupational programs in all post-secondary institutions, which serves as a statewide accreditation program.
OREGON		
Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission	Yes ---Proposed guidelines for statewide evaluation now being developed.	
PENNSYLVANIA		
Pennsylvania Department of Education	No	
TEXAS		
Texas Coordinating Board, College and University System	Yes ---Criteria and procedures for institutional application are now being adopted.	

STATE AGENCIES FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING IN THIS SURVEY	STATE LEVEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?	CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED
Texas Education Agency	Yes	Nine criteria used for evaluation of vocational programs, including manpower needs, access, job placement, etc.
VIRGINIA		
State Council on Higher Education for Virginia	Yes	1. No. of graduates in associate degree programs 2. "Service function" of the program Biennial evaluations of all associate degree programs conducted.
State Board for Community Colleges	Yes	Virginia Community College System applies above criteria and conducts biennial evaluations, and makes recommendations to the Board relative to program continuation, discontinuatio or merger with other programs
WASHINGTON		
State Board for Community College Education	Yes --Criteria and procedures now being formalized by the State Board. Strong emphasis on statewide manpower criteria.	
WEST VIRGINIA		
West Virginia Board of Regents	Yes	1. Cost 2. Institutional priority 3. Quality 4. Output State Board staff reviews programs on a regular basis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arkansas Department of Higher Education. "Review of Existing Instructional Programs, 1975-76 ," unpublished document, 1976.

California Community College System. Community College Occupational Programs Evaluation System, (October, 1975).

Community College Career Program Evaluation Committee. A System for the Evaluation of Career Programs in Community Colleges of Maryland. Annapolis: Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1974.

Maryland State Board for Community Colleges. Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 6 (February, 1975).

North Carolina Department of Community Colleges. Standards and Evaluative Criteria, (December, 1975).

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. "Criteria and Procedures for the Evaluation of Technical-Occupational Programs in Oklahoma Postsecondary Education," unpublished document, 1975.

_____. Guide for the Evaluation and Accreditation of Institutions in Oklahama Higher Education, (August, 1975).

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. "The Quantitative Evaluation of Degree Programs," unpublished document, 1974.

Virginia Department of Community Colleges. "Programs are Dropped." The VCCS News, (Winter, 1976).

Wattenbarger, James L. and Sakaguchi, Melvyn. State Level Boards for Community Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1971.

Notes on the Authors

Robert W. Day is Curriculum Coordinator of the Division of Educational Services for the South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education. He received his doctorate from the Florida State University where he had been awarded a W.K. Kellogg Foundation fellowship. Prior to that he had served as Assistant to the Executive Secretary of the Commission on Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Dr. Day has been active with various national organizations including the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges.

Louis W. Bender is Director of the State and Regional Higher Education Center and Professor of Higher Education at the Florida State University. He served as State Director of Community Colleges for five years and Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education for two years in Pennsylvania before coming to FSU in 1970. He serves on a Task Force of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools charged with developing institutional evaluation criteria for proprietary postsecondary institutions. He also serves on a number of national advisory boards for organizations concerned with postsecondary education including the Education Commission of the States, In-Service Education Program and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 17 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

Selected Publications of the FSU State and Regional Higher Education Center

TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE
Management Concepts and Higher Education	Louis W. Bender and Richard C. Richardson, Jr.	May, 1972
Danger: Will External Degrees Reincarnate Bogus Degree Mills? A Challenge to State and National Agencies	Louis W. Bender and James A. Davis	July, 1972
Content Analysis As a Research Tool for Higher Education	Melvene Draheim Hardee, Editor	August, 1972
First-Level Management: Legal Implications and Responsibilities for Selection and Retention of the Seventies	Department of Higher Education, Florida State University	February, 1973
A Plan For Planning For a State Community College System	Lee G. Henderson	June, 1973
Long-Range Planning For Community College Education	John C. Mundt	July, 1973
Institutional Responsibility in the Development of Faculty Dismissal Criteria	H. M. Holderfield and Frank D. Brown	August, 1973
California Views Toward Statewide Governance of Community Colleges	Sidney W. Brossman	September, 1973
One Dupont Circle: National Influence Center for Higher Education?	Louis W. Bender and Howard L. Simmons	November, 1973
Articulation of Post-Secondary Programs in Occupational Education	E. B. Moore, Jr.	November, 1973
The Evolution of the Nebraska Comprehensive Technical Community College System	Robert C. Schleiger	January, 1974
Section 1202 and Statewide Planning for Public Community and Junior Colleges: The New Reality	T. Harry McKinney	July, 1974
A Funding Pattern for Oregon Community College Construction	C. M. deBroekert	July, 1974
Northampton County Area Community College Adjusts to the Seventies	Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Editor	July, 1974
Grantsmanship: Federal Context from State Level Prespective	Bonny Franke	March, 1975
New Responses to New Problems Facing The Rural Community College (16th Annual SCCLP Workshop Proceedings)	Joyce Clampitt, Editor	March, 1975
Cooperative Education: Conception to Credibility	Louis W. Bender, Aaron D. Lucas, and Daniel C. Holsenbeck	April, 1975
Tools, Techniques, and Strategies For Staff Responses to Problems of State Level Leadership (ECS/SHEEO Seminar Proceedings)	Louis W. Bender and Joyce A. Clampitt, Editor	May, 1975

Complimentary copies of all publications are sent to State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges, University Libraries, National Organizations, and the ERIC Clearinghouse at UCLA. Individual copies may be ordered. A Charge of $3.00 for each monograph ordered is necessary to cover printing and mailing costs. Checks should be made out to FSU State and Regional Higher Education Center.